

MOTION FILED

FILE COPY

SEP 17 1971

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1971

No. 70-18

JANE ROE, *et al*

vs.

HENRY WADE

Supreme Court, U.S.

FILED

SEP 17 1971

E. ROBERT SEAVER, CLERK


Appellant,

Appellee

ON APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO SUBMIT A BRIEF
AMICI CURIAE
BRIEF OF WOMEN FOR THE UNBORN ET AL
IN SUPPORT OF APPELLEES

Eugene J. McMahon
Attorney for
Women For The Unborn
et al
103-42 Lefferts Boulevard
Richmond Hill, New York



INDEX

	Page
MOTION	2
INTEREST OF THE AMICI CURIAE	2
BRIEF OF AMICI CURIAE	8
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	9
ARGUMENT	10
I	10
II	12
III	16
CONCLUSION	18

TABLE OF CITATIONS

Miscellaneous:

"Cabbies Accused of Fleecing Abortion-Case Women, <i>The New York Times</i> , September 9, 1971, p. 87.	14
"Consultants' Report On Abortion," <i>British Medical Journal</i> (May 30, 1970), p. 534	16
Eastman, N. and Hellman, L., <i>William's Obstetrics</i> (Meredith Publishing Company), p. 345	13
Harris Poll of June 1970	16
Hilgers, T. and Shearin, R., <i>Induced Abortion: A Documented Report</i> (Written Presentation to Minnesota State Legislature, January 1971), p. 17	12
Hook, K., "Refused Abortion: A Follow Up Study of 249 Women Whose Applications Were Refused by the National Board of Health in Sweden," Proceedings of the Scandinavian Psychiatric Association, Vol. 39: Supplement 168, 1963.	13

Kolstad, P., "Therapeutic Abortion: A Clinical Study Based Upon 968 Cases From a Norwegian Hospital, 1940-53" in the Proceedings of the Scandinavian Gynecological and Obstetrical Society, Vol. 36: Supplement 6, 1957.	13
<i>Long Island Press</i> , February 22, 1970.	11

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1971

No. 70-18

JANE ROE, *et al*

Appellant,

vs.

HENRY WADE

Appellee

ON APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO SUBMIT A BRIEF
AMICI CURIAE
BRIEF OF WOMEN FOR THE UNBORN ET AL
IN SUPPORT OF APPELLEES

Eugene J. McMahon
Attorney for
Women For The Unborn
et al
103-42 Lefferts Boulevard
Richmond Hill, New York

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO SUBMIT A BRIEF AMICI CURIAE

To the Honorable, the Chief Justice and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States:

Women For The Unborn et al respectfully move for leave to file the accompanying brief in these cases as *amici curiae*.

INTEREST OF THE AMICI CURIAE

The interest of the organizations and the persons listed below as *amici curiae* in this case arises from the fact that there are appearing before this Court *amici curiae* and other groups of women who are advancing the rights of women alone. We are stressing the rights of the unborn without overlooking the rights of the mothers. This brief will treat the psychological, medical and other factors involved as well as legal points. However, it will not duplicate material presented in other briefs.

Respectfully submitted,

Women For The Unborn
Diane Arrigan, President
1714 Laurel Street
Merrick, New York
Representing 2000 women

Celebrate Life
Lucille Buffalino, Chairman
6 Howe Street
Huntington Station, New York
Representing 1500 women

Women Concerned For The Unborn Child
Mrs. Norbet Winter, President
1708 Fallowfield Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Representing 1500 women

Minnesota Citizens Concerned For Life, Inc.
 Mrs. Robert Joyce, Central District Coordinator
 1248 North 13th Avenue
 St. Cloud, Minnesota
 Representing 8000 women

New York State Council Columbiettes
 Mrs. Edward Ahl, President
 21 Manor Place
 Kingston, New York
 Representing 10,000 women

Regina Bakota, R.N.
 168 E. Loines Avenue
 Merrick, New York

Ruth Manning, R.N.
 1812 Gormley Avenue
 Merrick, New York

Rosemary Johnson, R.N.
 20 Sheridan Street
 Old Bethpage, New York

Claire Hoode, R.N.
 77 Morton Blvd.
 Plainview, New York

Sue McRedmond, R.N.
 31, Sheridan Street
 Old Bethpage, New York

Carmela Sardi, R.N.
 18 Beacon Lane
 Hicksville, New York

Kay Mulaney, R.N.
 92 Cafry Avenue
 Bethpage, New York

E. J. Picon, R.N.
 29 Deborah Drive
 Plainview, New York

Ann Devaney, R.N.
 7 Cullen Drive
 East Northport, New York

Mary Collin, R.N.
 9 Pall Alto Drive
 Plainview, New York

Peg McCale, R.N.
 453 Atlantic Street
 East Northport, New York

Regina Pfeiffer, R.N.
 314 Blue Point West
 Holtsville, New York

Maureen O'Rourke, R.N.
 608 Baylor Drive
 East Northport, New York

Margaret Taylor, R.N.
 47-42 245th Street
 Douglaston, New York

Mary Plascyk, R.N.
 101 Roundtree Drive
 Plainview, New York

Marilyn Bauer, R.N.
 98 Monroe Street
 Massapequa, New York

Eleanor Krauss, R.N.
 69 Hewlett Street
 Hempstead, New York

Mary Heil, R.N.
 71-11 Yellowstone Blvd.
 Forest Hills, New York

Barbara Donohue, R.N.
 10 Acorn Circle
 Towson, Maryland

Regina Beaver, R.N.
 5320 Fifth Street
 Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Blanche McCabe, R.N.
141 DeForest Road
Dix Hills, New York

Jane Farrell, R.N.
7 Hampton Place
Lynbrook, New York

Johanna Lutz, R.N.
150 East 91st Street
New York, New York

Ann Flood, R.N.
97-71 Fux Ford Road
Richmond, Virginia

Agnes Plessner, R. N.
18 North Third Street
Peekskill, New York

Rosemarie Hargrave, R.N.
158 Whaley Street
Freeport, New York

Frances Donofrio, R. N.
45-11 156th Street
Flushing, New York

Jeraldine Cohug, R.N.
26 Pershing Street
Dumont, New Jersey

Mary Jane Tobin, R.N.
168 Elsie Avenue
Merrick, New York

Judith Foye, R. N.
20 Alan Avenue
Danbury, Connecticut

Imelda Jensen, R.N.
16 Lark Avenue
Old Bethpage, New York

Janet Ott R.N.
621 South Long Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Eileen Doyle, R.N.
28 Rockville Avenue
Rockville Centre, New York

Frances Eagan, R.N.
60-37 69th Lane
Masbeth, New York

Mary Jane Russo, R.N.
956 Fairview Drive
Toms River, New Jersey

Ann Ward, M.D.
754 Montauk Highway
West Islip, New York

Therese Kutz, M. D.
35 Ingram Blvd.
Hempstead, New York

Mary Patricia Warner, M.D.
328 E. Irbin
Hagerstown, Maryland

Jeanette DeAngelis, M.D.
375 E. Main Street
Bayshore, New York

Mary L. Bailey, M.D.
4148 Rockwood Drive
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Helen Uhlrick, Ph. D.
5320 5th Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Dolores Amar, M.D.
36-12 Tonobah Street
Seaford, New York

Patricia Squillace, M.D.
287 Hempstead Avenue
Rockville Centre, New York

Marilyn Galligan, R.N.
98 Sterling Road
Elmont, New York

Florence Bernhardt, R.N.
3822 Allen Court
Seaford, New York

Loretta Kearney, R.N.
466 Argyle Road
Mineola, New York

Jeraldine Mattingly, R.N.
267 Haypath Road
Old Bethpage, New York

Mary Ann Donohue, R.N.
89 Round Tree Drive
Plainview, New York

Mary Zorro, R.N.
57 Grover Lane
East Northport, New York

Sheila Ryan, R.N.
175-44 Henly Road
Jamaica, New York

Jane Cummings, R.N.
90 Georgia Lane
Syosset, New York

Eileen McCormack, R.N.
1818 Hanover Place
Merrick, New York

Regina Vente, R.N.
2 Arbor Gate
Old Bethpage, New York

Olga Peters, R.N.
1 Gordon Avenue
Plainview, New York

Marilyn Webb, R.N.
7 Hunter Lane
Levittown, New York

Nora Fagan, R.N.
10 Jefferson Avenue
E. Islip, New York

Stephanie Horan, R.N.
162 Whitetail Lane
Central Islip, New York

Gloria Pipolo, R.N.
274 East 17th Street
Huntington Station, New York

Rita Mazzetilli, R.N.
10 Montana Street
Huntington Station, New York

Catherine Tower, R.N.
North Shore Hospital
Manhasset, New York

Mary Ellen Quinn, R.N.
3218 Perrysville Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Joan Arslanian, R.N.
2 Farragut Place
Huntington, New York

Barbara Shellock, R.N.
102 Manchester Street
Westbury, New York

Ruth Sekora, R.N.
19 Landview Drive
Dix Hills, New York

Jean Dillinger, R.N.
45 Broadway
Rockville Centre, New York

Ruth Braune, R.N.
34 King Street
Floral Park, New York

Regina Geib, R.N.
3 Francis Path
Rocky Point, New York

Bridgit Norell, R.N.
218 Gilling Road
Seaford, New York

Dorothy Short, R.N.
63-02 39th Avenue
Woodside, New York

Margaret Glacier, R.N.
34 Stonyhollow Road
Centerport, New York

Jane Donohue, R.N.
635 Lochner Road
Columbia, South Carolina

Eileen Donlon, R.N.
45-54 39th Place
Sunnyside, New York

Jodi McCarthy, R.N.
8 Pinook Court
Huntington Station, New York

Patricia Tymann, R.N.
18 Fox Place
Levittown, New York

Pat Killoran, R.N.
536 Beech 22nd Street
Far Rockaway, New York

Jean Dealy, R. N.
347 Harrison Drive
Massapequa, New York

Eleanor Penisi, R.N.
44 Columbia Place
Rockville Centre, New York

Jacqueline Licalzi, R.N.
17 Andover Road
Rockville Centre, New York

Joan Morrissey, R.N.
15 Central Parkway
Merrick, New York

Margaret M. Nicholson, M.D.
1801 I Northwest
Washington Medical Building
Washington, D.C.

Mary Lou Cook, R.N.
139 Bellwood Lane
Munhall, Pennsylvania

Josephine Milstone, R.N.
11 Longridge Road
Plainview, New York

Marilyn Webb, R.N.
7 Hunter Lane
Levittown, New York

Laura Tracy, R.N.
6 Charles Street
Islip Terrace, New York

Jane Cummings, R.N.
90 Georgia Lane
Syosset, New York

Lorraine Wagner, R.N.
485 Maritta Place
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Valerie Detwiler, R.N.
26 Alabama Street
Long Beach, New York

Rosemary Rathgeber
2687 E. Bayview Avenue
Merrick, New York

Linda Beldy, R.N.
101 Hillwood Lane
Plainview, New York

Consulting Physicians

Paul Barunstein, M.D.
375 East Main Street
Bayshore, New York

Jerald Buetow, M.D.
754 Montauk Highway
W. Islip, New York

Robert McCormack, M.D.
375 E. Main Street
Bayshore, New York

Francis Bauer, M.D.
5 Whitehall Drive
Huntington Station, New York

John R. DeFilippi, M.D.
181 Main Street
Huntington, New York

Walter Del Gaudio, M.D.
46 Randolph Drive
Dix Hills, New York

James Halloran, M.D.
155 W. Merrick Road
Freeport, New York

Lew E. Sibeu, M.D.
419 Conetquot Avenue
Islip Terrace, New York

Bernard Ryan, M. D.
375 East Main Street
Bayshore, New York

Vincent Moriarity, M.D.
325 Park Avenue
Huntington, New York

Joseph Martocci, M.D.
47 Jerome Street
Lindenhurst, New York

Charles J. Derrico, M.D.
61 Ridge Drive
Plainview, New York

John McCloy, M.D.
345 E. Old Country Road
Hicksville, New York

Joseph Dottino, M.D.
79 Grand Avenue
Massapequa, New York

Joseph Noya, M.D.
4277 Hempstead Tpke.
Bethpage, New York

Hamdi Oruci, M.D.
316 Boundry Avenue
Massapequa, New York

Neal Palladino, M.D.
206 Water Lane South
Levittown, New York

Anthony Carotenuto, M.D.
404 Jerusalem Avenue
Hicksville, New York

Anthony Barbaro, M.D.
79 Grand Avenue
Massapequa, New York

Thomas R. Quinn, D.D.S.
89 Widgeon Court
Great River, New York

Neil Shoor, D.D.S.
2980 Hewlett Avenue
Merrick, New York

Vincent DeAnglis, M.D.
375 E. Main Street
Bayshore, New York

Francis O'Malley, M.D.
24 Brentwood Road
Bayshore, New York

William McCully, M.D.
92 Arnold Avenue
West Babylon, New York

Thomas McGowan, M.D.
269 Huntington Bay Road
Huntington Bay, New York

Paul MacNamarra, M.D.
P. O. Box 324
South Jamesport, New York

Edgar Tonna, Ph. D.
9 Geiger Place
Huntington, New York

Anthony Firenzi, M.D.
81 New Street
Huntington, New York

Raymond Portu, M.D.
16 Ebbitide Lane
Dix Hills, New York

Richard Simpovich, M.D.
7 High Street
Huntington, New York

Peter Januzzi, M.D.
180 East Pulaski Road
Huntington, New York

Anthony Cherry, M.D.
180 East Pulaski Road
Huntington Station, New York

Arthur Marrese, M.D.
1257 Montauk Highway
West Islip, New York

Robert Ryan, M.D.
294 West Merrick Road
Freeport, New York

Eugene Mickiewicz, M.D.
2851 Jerusalem Avenue
Wantagh, New York

Walter Clarkson, M.D.
761 Montauk Highway
West Islip, New York

James LaVine, M.D.
294 West Merrick Road
Freeport, New York

John McCormack, M.D.
101 Fairview Road
Massapequa, New York

John Egner, M.D.
754 Montauk Highway
West Islip, New York

Charles Molano, M.D.
364 Redmaple Drive
Wantagh, New York

William DeVries, M.D.
520 Franklin Avenue
Garden City, New York

John Rooney, M.D.
2 Anding Place
North Merrick, New York

Alfred Marx, M.D.
21-16 Merrick Avenue
Merrick, New York

John Battenfeld, M.D.
360 North Village Avenue
Rockville Centre, New York

William McCully, M.D.
92 Arnold Avenue
West Babylon, New York

Joseph Kennedy, M.D.
747 Montauk Highway
West Islip, New York

Francis B. Martin, M.D.
321 North Village Avenue
Rockville Centre, New York

~~Thomas~~ Wilcours, M.D.
1145 Montauk Highway
West Islip, New York

Murray Elkins, M.D.
10101 159th Avenue
Howard Beach, New York

George Lawrence, M.D.
40-27 Murray Street
Flushing, New York

Joseph Tormey, M.D.
520 Franklin Avenue
Garden City, New York

Thomas McManus, M.D.
1145 Montauk Highway
West Islip, New York

Lester Candela, M.D.
112-25 Queens Blvd.
Forest Hills, New York

Thomas Lyons, M.D.
1145 Montauk Highway
West Islip, New York

Eugene J. McMahon
Counsel for
Women For The Unborn et al

September 17, 1971

**BRIEF OF WOMEN FOR THE UNBORN ET AL
AS AMICI CURIAE**

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

Women have traditionally been the guardians of life.

It is to plead on behalf of life that we have prepared this brief. As women and mothers, we ask the Justices of the Supreme Court to consider our views, which can be summed up in the following four statements:

(1) The unborn child is a distinct individual. Modern genetics has confirmed scientifically what women have long felt intuitively—the presence of another human life, a life to be revered and protected.

(2) Many women who seek abortions are acting from an overpowering but temporary fear. Most of these women really desire to have their baby, and they will later be glad that their effort to secure an abortion was unsuccessful. In order to react constructively to the stresses and tensions of pregnancy, women need the support of society—not the address of the nearest abortion clinic.

(3) While abortion is an easy solution for many social problems, it is not a true solution for any. Its availability may prevent more constructive solutions from emerging.

(4) The social consequences of unlimited abortion are as yet unknown. Furthermore, both the moral and the legal arguments for abortion-on-demand have attained popularity only within the last few years. Since the test of time has not been applied, should a final decision be made which would extend abortion-on-demand to the entire country?

ARGUMENT

I

The unborn child is a distinct individual.

In August 1963, in a pamphlet entitled "Plan Your Children For Health and Happiness," Planned Parenthood had this to say about abortion:

"An abortion requires an operation. It kills the life of a baby after it has begun. It is dangerous to your life and health. It may make you sterile so that when you want a child you cannot have it. Birth control merely postpones the beginning of life." ¹

Aside from the medical factors, we ask the Court to note the clear statement—made in the manner of a truism—that the life involved is a "baby" and that what abortion does is to "kill the life of a baby after it has begun." The moral distinction between postponing life and taking human life after it has begun could not be put more succinctly.

We realize that the pro-abortionists are often acting out of mercy. They want to save the mother—and occasionally the child—from future suffering. But is that sufficient reason to kill?

The answer to that depends upon what we are killing. When a dog or a cat is suffering terribly, we kill it out of mercy. When a man or a woman is suffering terribly, we do not kill. Why? Not because we think less of a man than of a cat, but because we think more. We believe that the man has a certain infinite dignity we should respect.

1) Although Planned Parenthood in 1971 looks more favorably on abortion, we believe this 1963 quotation is important because of ad hominem arguments that are frequently made against people opposing abortion. "Abortion kills the life of a baby after it has begun." If this is only an unusual Roman Catholic religious belief, would it follow that in 1963 Planned Parenthood was dominated by the Catholic Church? Or would it follow that Planned Parenthood was ignorant of modern medicine? Is either hypothesis a plausible one? Like other important social questions, the abortion question must be settled on the evidence itself—not on speculation about the motives or religion of people on either side.

Dr. Mortimer J. Adler, a leading authority on the history of moral questions, wrote the following on February 22, 1970:

"The classical debate over abortion always centered on its relation to homicide. . . . As far back as ancient Greece, the prevailing opinion seems to have been that the destruction of a human life free of personal guilt was murder, and that the distinction between a human child within and a human child outside the womb did not affect this principle."²

According to Dr. Adler, the only unsolved question concerned the existence of human life in the very early stages of pregnancy.³ Until modern times, no certain answer could be given to that question since the necessary biological information was not available. But, in Dr. Adler's words, "the advances in medical knowledge seems to have had only one relevant effect: everything we now know about the chemical structure of the genes and their relation to life seems to indicate that the embryo is a fully potential human being from

2) The February 22, 1970 quotations from Dr. Adler are taken from his column in the Long Island Press.

3) Now that modern science has thrown light on this question, it should be noted that advocates of abortion are increasingly abandoning any distinction between early and late pregnancy.

Consider, for example, the position taken by New Yorkers for Abortion Law Repeal (Box 240, Planetarium Station, New York City, New York). During the 1971 New York legislative session, this organization lobbied extensively for a removal of that part of the new abortion law restricting abortion-on-demand to the first 24 weeks. In their informational material, New Yorkers for Abortion Law Repeal raised the question, "Isn't there a possibility that after 24 weeks the fetus will survive?" and replied, "With recent developments in medical technology, it is rapidly becoming possible for a fetus to survive outside the uterus at ANY stage of development—but this is not adequate reason to forbid abortion." (The emphasis on the word "any" was made by the abortion organization itself.)

We request the Court to note the two statements: first, that viability is becoming possible at any stage of development; second, that it makes no difference whatever.

the moment of conception. It is not surprising, therefore, that the proponents of abortion in the contemporary controversy tend to disregard the question of the human status of the embryo."

In considering the constitutionality of laws restricting abortion, is not the human status of the unborn child a significant consideration?

II

The woman is acting from fear.

Would it not be best to leave the abortion decision to the woman herself? After all, should not every woman possess the right to control her own body?

While these questions are sincerely asked, we believe they overlook two important factors. The first we have already discussed. A woman should have the right to control her own body, but the unborn baby is not just a part of her body.

But there is also a second factor. Let us consider the pregnant woman herself.

A woman who is pregnant experiences periods of great stress. Like most people at moments of high tension, she is often tempted to do certain things which she would not contemplate for an instant under normal circumstances. The fear within her is so overpowering that all long-range considerations fade away.

We do not want to overstate our case. Rarely does the fear result in suicide or permanent psychological damage to the woman. (In fact, suicide in the pregnant woman is about 1/6th the rate seen in nonpregnant women of the same age.⁴) Nevertheless, the temporary fear is great enough to

4) Hilgers, T. and Shearin, R., Induced Abortion: A Documented Report (Written Presentation to Minnesota State Legislature, January 1971), p. 17.

bring many of us to near-panic. On such occasions, we can actually do what we really do not want to do—unless there is someone who will both restrain us from taking “the easy way out” and help us to face our fear in a constructive way.

What we are describing is something very common, as is pointed out by Gardiner in Williams Obstetrics, 13th edition, 1966. Here is what he says:

“It is not unusual (however) for women who will become good mothers, or those who have already demonstrated their excellent maternal qualities with their older children, to react initially to the diagnosis of pregnancy with resentment, frustration and depression, only to express strong, genuine, positive feelings of acceptance as the pregnancy advances and fetal movements appear.”⁵

A Norwegian study by P. Kolstad⁶ confirms Gardiner's statement. Kolstad reports on 113 women who were refused a legal abortion and who then carried the pregnancy to term. 84% were later glad that the pregnancy was not terminated, 9% were uncertain, and only 7% were discontented.

(Incidentally, this study, as well as a similar study by Hook⁷ in Sweden, disputes the claim that a woman refused a legal abortion will simply go elsewhere. In the Swedish study, which involved 249 women refused a legal abortion,

5) Eastman, N. and Hellman, L., William's Obstetrics (Meredith Publishing Company), p. 345.

6) Kolstad, P., “Therapeutic Abortion: A Clinical Study Based Upon 968 Cases From a Norwegian Hospital, 1940-53” in the Proceedings of the Scandinavian Gynecological and Obstetrical Society, Vol. 36: Supplement 6, 1957.

7) Hook, K., “Refused Abortion: A Follow Up Study of 249 Women Whose Applications Were Refused by the National Board of Health in Sweden,” Proceedings of the Scandinavian Psychiatric Association, Vol. 39: Supplement 168, 1963.

86% did not go elsewhere and carried their pregnancy to term.)

If so many women seeking an abortion really want their children, why do they act in this way? Gardiner describes the emotional reactions of the women involved as "so real and life-threatening" that they "reject the existence of the pregnancy before they, themselves, are engulfed and destroyed." He refers to this phenomenon as a "spell" of "distorted thinking and reasoning."⁸

In other words, a pregnant woman often feels like a person with claustrophobia. The walls are closing in. There is an overpowering desire to escape. Just as a man with claustrophobia may try to leave a moving train, although he will later be glad that someone restrained him, so a woman may seek an abortion but afterwards rejoice that she has been allowed to give birth.

If all this is true, is it really merciful for our society to step aside?

On September 9, 1971, an article in the New York Times expressed concern about young girls arriving in New York for abortions.⁹ According to the article, some taxicab drivers were taking advantage of them. Because of the strain the young girls were under as well as their relative inexperience, they could not protect themselves from the excessive prices charged by unscrupulous drivers.

Imagine! Because she is young, fearful, and alone, society is afraid to leave to the girl herself the decision about the proper taxicab to take from the airport. But society is

8) Eastman and Hellman, op. cit., p. 346.

9) "Cabbies Accused of Fleecing Abortion-Case Women," The New York Times, p. 87.

now asked to let that same girl face alone¹⁰ the most awesome decision of all—whether to take the life within her or give birth to her child.

As women,¹¹ we believe the state laws restricting abortions protect both thousands of unborn babies and thousands of mothers. Therefore, we respectfully ask the Justices of this Court not to strike them down.

10) It is sometimes said that the abortion decision would be left to the woman and her doctor.

While this might have some validity in cases of therapeutic abortion, does it apply to abortions performed for economic and social reasons—not for medical reasons? Since a medical judgment is not involved, the doctor's role in the decision for a socio-economic abortion is likely to be no greater than the bus driver's role in a woman's decision to take a bus trip to Chicago. While the driver is needed as an instrument, would one be justified in claiming that the decision for such a journey had been made by the woman and her bus driver?

Forgetting that medical factors are not involved, the argument is sometimes raised that the prohibition against socio-economic abortions interferes with a doctor's right to practice medicine as he judges best. In reality, socio-economic abortions have nothing to do with medicine—any more than piercing the ears or operating on the nose for reasons of facial beauty are connected with medicine. A socio-economic abortion does not improve the woman's health. Needless to say, it certainly does not improve the health of the child.

11) How representative of American women are the views we are expressing? According to a Harris Poll of June 1970, 55% of American women opposed abortion-on-demand, while only 37% favored it. Opposition to abortion crossed religious lines, as the following breakdown indicates:

<u>Abortion-On-Demand</u>	<u>Approve</u>	<u>Disapprove</u>	<u>Not Sure</u>
<u>Total Population</u>	40%	50%	10%
By Religion:			
Protestant	39%	49%	12%
Catholic	30%	64%	6%
Jewish	71%	18%	11%

The easy solution of abortion

discourages more constructive solutions.

Even if one overlooks the biological evidence concerning the unborn child, or the psychological testimony that most women seeking to take the life of their unborn baby, like most persons seeking to take their own life, desire to be stopped by someone, is abortion really a satisfactory solution to any social problem?

Will the availability of the easier abortion "solution" discourage our society from seeking deeper and more permanent solutions?

Such a fear appears to lie behind the opposition to abortion-on-demand within the black community. Despite assurances by abortion advocates, many members of the black community seem to suspect that numerous abortion clinics in ghetto areas could end up as the "white man's" solution to the problems of poverty and race.¹²

When the poor cry out for bread, what response will they receive? The more difficult response—an equitable distribution of society's resources? Or the easier response—a list of centers where abortions can be performed on those who would not seek them except for their desperate poverty? While these two responses are not mutually exclusive, to what extent will the availability of the second lessen society's incentive to seek the first?

Sponsors of non-abortion family planning have also expressed concern that reliance on abortion could lessen the effectiveness of their efforts.¹³ Could abortion-on-demand adversely affect other programs which require a commitment

12) According to the 1970 Harris Poll, 57% of the black community opposed abortion-on-demand, 29% favored it, and 14% were uncertain.

13) "Consultants' Report On Abortion," British Medical Journal (May 30, 1970), p. 534.

of society's resources—e.g., programs to assist the unwed mother or efforts to provide easily accessible counseling services for all women who need such support in order to respond constructively to the anxieties they experience during pregnancy?

Perhaps these fears about the adverse social effects of easy abortion will turn out to be unfounded. At the moment, however, that is far from certain. Until some kind of definite evidence is available concerning the social pattern that is emerging in those states which have removed all restrictions on abortion, should a final decision be made which would extend abortion-on-demand to the entire country? For if easy abortion does indeed produce such undesirable social effects, would this not be a ground in itself for state regulation of the practice?

If a verdict of unconstitutionality is reached concerning state laws which protect the unborn child and the mother herself from an immediate decision to terminate life, then the legislative discussion is over. If these laws are held to be constitutional, their wisdom will continue to be debated in our state and national legislatures.

If any doubt exists, would it not be better to allow the discussion to continue?

On behalf of the unborn child. . .the mother. . .and society itself. . .we ask the Court to preserve the right of the state to protect unborn human life.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated herein, Women For The Unborn *et al* respectfully submit that the statutes challenged herein should be sustained on the grounds that permissive abortion constitutes an infringement on the rights and interests of women as well as of unborn children.

Respectfully submitted,

Eugene J. McMahon
Attorney for
Women For The Unborn
et al
103-42 Lefferts Boulevard
Richmond Hill, New York